



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,783	08/30/2001	Jamal Ghani	R272-001.3	1816
31955	7590	03/22/2005	EXAMINER	
CAPSTONE LAW GROUP LLP 1810 GATEWAY DRIVE SUITE 260 SAN MATEO, CA 94404			KE, PENG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,783	GHANI, JAMAL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peng Ke	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/1/04.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunlap et al. (US 6,560,637) in view of Black et al. (US 2002/0059317).

As per claim 1, Dunlap et al. teaches a method for converting an application specific presentation file stored in a first data store with corresponding metadata to a universal format for display on a web browser, comprising the steps of:

reading the metadata corresponding to the application specific file from the database (col. 4, lines 1-20; When files conversion engine tries to convert presentation files to JPEG or GIF format, the engine must first identify the file type/metadata of the presentation file, which may be PowerPoint, Word or Excel);

loading the application specific file from the database (col. 4, lines 24-26);

converting the application specific file into a universal image file format (col. 4, lines 20-35);

Art Unit: 2174

modifying the resolution of the universal format file; (col. 4, lines 20-30; Examiner interprets JPEG or GIF to the universal format file because they can be view by a browser without requiring special plug-ins or controls)

validating the resolution of the universal format file (col. 4, lines 20-30); and
storing the modified universal format file in a second data store for display on the web browser (col. 4, lines 35-54).

However, Dunlap et al. fails to teaches

determining from the metadata whether the file extension corresponds to the specific application;

validating that the application specific file corresponds to the specific application by examining header information of the application specific file;

Black et al. teaches determining from the metadata whether the file extension corresponds to the specific application (paragraph 60);

validating that the application specific file corresponds to the specific application by examining header information of the application specific file (paragraph 60);

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Black's teaching with method of Dunlap et al. in order to allow the file converter to identify the data file type of presentation because there are multiple types of file that a user may submit.

As per claim 2, Dunlap and Black teach the method recited in claim 1. Dunlap further teaches the method comprising the steps of:

uploading the application specific file to the first data store (col. 3, lines 54-68); and
detecting the uploaded application specific file in the database (col. 4, lines 15-55).

As per claim 3, Dunlap and Black teach the method recited in claim 1. Dunlap further teaches the method comprising the step of:

transmitting the modified universal format file to the web browser for display (col. 4, lines 50- 68).

As per claim 4, Dunlap and Black teach the method recited in claim 1. Dunlap further teaches the universal image file format is a JPEG format (col. 4, line 23).

As per claim 6, Dunlap and teaches the method recited in claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

converting the modified universal format file to an image stream (col. 5, lines 25-68); and transmitting the image stream to the web browser for display (col. 4, lines 15-55).

As per claim 7, Dunlap teaches a method for converting a PowerPoint formatted presentation file stored in a first data store with corresponding metadata to a universal format for display on a web browser, comprising the steps of:

uploading the PowerPoint file to the database (col. 4, lines 1-20);

detecting the uploaded PowerPoint file in the database (col. 4, lines 1-20);

reading the metadata corresponding to the PowerPoint file from the database (col. 4, lines 1-20; When files conversion engine tries to convert presentation files to JPEG or GIF format, the engine must first identify the file type/metadata of the application file, which may be PowerPoint, Word or Excel);

loading the PowerPoint file from the database; (col. 4, lines 24-26)

dispatching the PowerPoint file to a converter algorithm application;

converting the PowerPoint file into a universal image file format format (col. 4, lines 20-35);

modifying the resolution of the universal format file; (col. 4, lines 20-30; Examiner interprets JPEG or GIF to the universal format file because they can be view by a browser without requiring special plug-ins or controls)

validating the resolution of the universal format file; (col. 4, lines 20-30)

storing the modified universal format file in a second data store (col. 4, lines 35-54); and

transmitting the modified universal format file to the web browser for display (col. 4, lines 15-55).

However, Dunlap fails to teach:

determining from the metadata whether the file extension corresponds to the specific application;

validating that the PowerPoint file corresponds to the specific application by examining header information of the PowerPoint file;

Black et al. teaches determining from the metadata whether the file extension corresponds to the specific application (paragraph 60);

validating that the application specific file corresponds to the specific application by examining header information of the application specific file (paragraph 60);

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Black's teaching with method of Dunlap et al. in order to allow the file converter to identify the data file type of presentation because there are multiple types of file that a user may submit.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above)

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above)

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 7, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (see rejection above)

As per claim 13, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above)

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above)

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (see rejection above)

Claims 5, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunlap et al. (US 6,560,637) in view of Black et al. (US 2002/0059317) further in view of Parker (US 6,341,178)

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 5, Dunlap et al. and Black teach the method recited in claim 1. However, they fail to teach wherein the modifying step modifies the resolution of the universal format file to 400 X 300.

Parker teaches the modifying step modifies the resolution of the universal format file to 400 X 300. (col. 8, lines 16-45)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include this well known feature with method of Dunlap and Black in order to display 1200 spi resolution image, which is preferred by those skilled in the art.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 7, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above)

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above)

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 18 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100